DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 961 PS 015 555

AUTHOR Anderson, Ariel L. H.; And Others
TITLE Socialization into the Student Role: Teacher and Student Influences. Research Series No. 160.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 85
CONTRACT 400-81-0014
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($3.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Behavior Standards; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; Discipline; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; *Elementary School Teachers; Interpersonal Competence; Interviews; Social Behavior; *Socialization; *Student Role; *Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS Social Problem Solving

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of a variety of student- and teacher-level variables on third through fifth grade children's socialization into the elementary school student role. Both content knowledge (i.e., knowledge of classroom rules and norms) and process knowledge (i.e., social problem-solving ability) aspects of the socialization process were explored. Throughout the paper two classroom-socialization domains were considered: adaptation to classroom task and interpersonal demands. Two primary teacher variables were examined: teacher socialization priority (task versus interpersonal focus) and teacher control orientation. Briefly, results indicated that teachers' socialization priorities have an impact on students' understanding of the normative structure of the classroom environment (content knowledge) and that teachers' control orientation was related to children's ability to socially solve (process knowledge), particularly in the task domain. Different student-level variables were found to predict social problem-solving ability in the task and interpersonal domains. (Author/DST)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED264961

Research Series No. 160

SOCIALIZATION INTO THE STUDENT ROLE: TEACHER AND STUDENT INFLUENCES

Ariel L. H. Anderson
Richard S. Prawat
Linda M. Anderson

Printed and Distributed
by the
College of Education
Michigan State University

November 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ariel L.H. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 015555

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-81-0014)

Institute for Research on Teaching

The **Institute for Research on Teaching** was founded at Michigan State University (MSU) in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. Following a nationwide competition in 1981, the NIE awarded a second five-year contract to MSU. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations for individual research projects.

The IRT conducts major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and teacher education. IRT researchers are also examining the teaching of specific school subjects such as reading, writing, general mathematics, and science and are seeking to understand how factors outside the classroom affect teacher decision making.

Researchers from such diverse disciplines as educational psychology, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy cooperate in conducting IRT research. They join forces with public school teachers who work at the IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, analyze and interpret results, and disseminate findings.

The IRT publishes research reports, occasional papers, conference proceedings, a newsletter for practitioners, and lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, and/or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the IRT Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Associate Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Richard S. Prawat

Editorial Staff
Editor: Sandra Gross
Assistant Editor: Patricia Nischan

Abstract

The present study examined the influence of a variety of student- and teacher-level variables on children's socialization into the elementary school student role. Both content knowledge (i.e., knowledge of classroom rules and norms) and process knowledge (i.e., social problem-solving ability) aspects of the socialization process were explored. Throughout the paper two classroom-socialization domains are considered: adaptation to classroom task and interpersonal demands. Two primary teacher variables were examined: teacher socialization priority (task versus interpersonal focus) and teacher control orientation. Briefly, we found that teachers' socialization priorities impact on students' understanding of the normative structure of the classroom environment (content knowledge) and that teachers' control orientation was related to children's ability to socially problem solve (process knowledge), particularly in the task domain. Different student-level variables were found to predict social problem-solving ability in the task and interpersonal domains. The results obtained here seem at least partially congruent with the more general teacher effectiveness and parental effectiveness literatures.

SOCIALIZATION INTO THE STUDENT ROLE: TEACHER AND STUDENT INFLUENCES[1]

Ariel L.H. Anderson, Richard S. Prawat, and Linda M. Anderson[2]

The purpose of this investigation, involving third- and fourth-grade teachers, was to examine how different variables may be related to successful socialization into the elementary school student role. The primary question of interest is "What distinguishes the socially competent student from one who is lacking in social competence?" The purposes of the study are first, to explore the relationships among various predictor variables, such as social problem-solving ability and social competence as measured by teacher ratings; and second, to explore the effects of certain teacher variables, such as socialization priority, on students' socialization status.

"Socialization" refers to the learning processes that enhance an individual's ability to participate successfully within a given social system (Biddle, 1979). The classroom can be viewed as such a system. Hartup (1979) refers to the school as a social world of major significance and states that "given the extent to which the school is used as a socializing agency, our lack of knowledge concerning its social dynamics is shocking" (p. 946). Since Hartup's call for further insight into the social world of the classroom, some progress has been made (e.g. Rohrkemper, 1981). However, relatively little is known about how children become socialized into the student role. Ongoing research by the Socialization Outcomes Project at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching is designed to examine aspects of the classroom socialization process. The main objective

---

[1]Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1985.

[2]Ariel Anderson is a research assistant with the Socialization Outcomes Project. Richard Prawat and Linda Anderson coordinate the project. Prawat is a professor, L. Anderson, an associate professor, and A. Anderson, an instructor of teacher education at Michigan State University.

of the overall study is to identify relationships among teachers' goal orientations in the socialization area, their classroom practices, and various student outcomes related to socialization. Central to the project's conceptual framework is the notion that students face dual role demands: They must adapt to classroom work demands placed on them as individual students while simultaneously learning to function as members of a classroom group. Thus, two primary socialization domains are considered throughout the research effort: adaptation to classroom task and "interpersonal" demands. Included under the task-demands rubric are important aspects of the student role such as being a good listener, getting work in on time, establishing work priorities, and being able to monitor one's understanding or comprehension. The social or interpersonal dimension is defined by outcomes such as sharing and helpfulness, becoming more accepting of others, and considering how one's actions may affect others.

The interview study reported here is part of the larger Socialization Outcomes Project. It focuses on students' content knowledge and process knowledge as it relates to their adjustment to classroom task and interpersonal demands. Content knowledge, as defined in this study, represents the extent to which a student is able to "read" the parameters of the classroom environment--that is, the important rules and standards governing classroom conduct. Process knowledge is conceived of as the ability to display problem-solving skills that facilitate conflict resolution in either the task-demands or interpersonal-socialization domain.

In this study, content knowledge was expected to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for behavioral adjustment in the classroom; process knowledge was expected to be the key variable relating to teacher ratings of social adjustment. Therefore, particular attention was given to ferreting

out relationships between a variety of student and teacher variables expected to influence students' social problem-solving ability.

Method

Subjects

Sixty-four students, eight in each of eight classrooms (Grades 3 through 5) were selected for inclusion in the study. Selections were made by imposing a specific set of criteria on teachers' ratings of students' social competence in the classroom. The teacher-rating scales used in the study were adapted from Harter (1979). Interest centered on target students who were, and were not, well socialized *overall* into the student role. Briefly, the following selection procedures were employed for each sex: The student with the highest composite socialization mean in each classroom (i.e., across the task-demands and interpersonal-adjustment domains) and the one with the lowest mean were chosen for inclusion in the study. Of the remaining students in each classroom, two were selected who represented nearly equidistant points between the two extremes already selected. Students represented a variety of racial/ethnic origins and had no known cognitive or perceptual deficits.

All eight classroom teachers were female, with an average of 20 years teaching experience. All teachers were currently participating in the Socialization Outcomes Project at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). They constitute a subsample of the 32 teachers involved in the overall study. Teachers differed in terms of their socialization priorities or the specific classroom socialization goals they held for their students. Teacher socialization priority was assessed by means of a 30-item questionnaire developed by project staff and administered to a sample of over 100 teachers (primarily at the third- and fourth-grade levels)

before the study began (see Prawat, Anderson, Anderson, Jenkins, & Anderson, 1983, for a description of this questionnaire). Four of the teachers whose students were involved in the interview study placed primary emphasis on the interpersonal-socialization domain, while the remaining four teachers stressed adaptation to classroom task demands. Of the eight teachers included in the study, five taught third grade, two taught fourth grade, and one taught fifth grade.

The sample, then, consisted of 64 elementary school students, 8 per class--4 male and 4 female; these 8 students ranged from high to low in terms of teacher ratings of socialization competence. Students attended schools located within the same medium-size, midwestern public school district.

Student Testing

In conjunction with the larger Socialization Outcomes Project, pre- and posttests were given to all students in order to assess the following:

1. Perceived competence in academic and social areas (items were selected from the Perceived Competence Scale for Children developed by Harter, 1982).
2. Intrinsic motivation (items on this measure were selected from the Scale of Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Orientation in the Classroom, also developed by Harter, 1980).
3. A sense of control over outcomes in academic and social areas (items were selected from Connell's, 1980, Multidimensional Measure of Children's Perceptions of Control).

In addition, achievement test data were available from the school district for the years of the study. Sociometric data relating to work- and playmate preference were also gathered using a technique developed by Singleton and

Asher (1979). (The data obtained in Numbers 1 and 2 above are not included in this paper.)

It might be helpful to provide a brief rationale for regarding the instruments listed above as measures of "socialization outcomes." The Singleton and Asher (1979) measure, when scored for amount of cross-sex and cross-race preferences evident in children's choice of work- and playmates, has proven to be sensitive to classroom variables such as the amount of small-group work engaged in by students (Nickerson & Prawat, 1981). The perceived competence, motivation, and control scales were selected, in part, because of recent work by Harter and Connell (1981), which uses causal analysis to examine relations between these variables and achievement.

The model that Harter and Connell tested has direct relevance for the task-demands area of socialization. In this model, the "cognitive unknown" scale is the prime mover; it impacts on academic achievement, which in turn affects perceived competence and, through this variable, intrinsic motivation. This causal model thus places primary emphasis on student "knowledge-ability" as a key variable. As Harter and Connell put it, "it is the child who is in the know, as it were (i.e., whose unknown score is low), who is the achiever" (p. 34). This model fits well with the theoretical biases of the Socialization Outcomes staff who feel that information giving, in the sense of providing students with the cognitive tools that allow them to regulate their personal and social behavior in the classroom, is a key aspect of the teacher's socialization role.

Student Interviews

Student interview responses constitute the primary data of this investigation. All students were interviewed during a two- to three-week period in March, 1983. Interviewers were blind as to the socialization status of subjects (based on teacher ratings) and the socialization priority of the subjects' teachers. All interviews were done by three white female adults who had considerable experience interviewing and working with children. The interview consisted of six major sections. Specific interview probes were designed to assess students' content knowledge and process knowledge in both the task-demands and interpersonal-socialization domains.

To determine content knowledge, students were asked, among other things, to (a) list classroom rules and provide a rationale for the most important of the rules, and (b) nominate (and describe) the best workers and those who get along best with others in class. Students were also asked to state the worst thing one could do in class, as well as what one could do to make his/her classroom teacher the happiest; rationales were solicited for these responses as well.

Process knowledge was assessed by asking students to respond to a series of four "open-middle" stories designed to measure children's means-ends thinking. Means-ends thinking has been defined as the "ability to carefully plan, step-by-step, means to reach a stated goal" (Shure & Spivack, 1972, p. 348). Means-ends thinking ability has been shown to relate to students' adjustment to both task demands and interpersonal aspects of classroom life (Shure & Spivack, 1972). In the present study, a modified version of the MEPS (means-ends problem solving) measure developed by Spivack, Platt, and Shure (1976; see Kendall & Fischler, 1984, for additional references), was used to assess students' social problem-solving ability; the Spivack et al. measure was modified so that it was appropriate not only for assessing

interpersonal problem solving, the original intent, but task-demands problem solving as well. Thus, open-middle stories representing problem situations in both socialization areas were included. The basic procedure involved presenting subjects with beginnings and endings of stories and asking them to supply the middle segments that were missing. (The scoring procedure is outlined in the Means-Ends Problem-Solving Stimuli and Scoring Procedures Supplement provided by Spivack, Shure and Platt (1981)). In our study, scores were obtained for each subject on overall social problem-solving ability, interpersonal social problem-solving ability, and task-related social problem-solving ability.

Teacher Variables

In addition to a questionnaire designed to assess teacher's socialization priorities (see discussion in subjects section), teachers were asked to respond to a questionnaire developed by Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, and Ryan (1981), which gets at adults' orientation toward control versus autonomy. The Deci scale consists of eight vignettes, each of which depicts a typical school problem. For each vignette, respondents were asked to rate the appropriateness of each of four alternative ways of dealing with the presented problem. The alternatives are said to represent points on a continuum from highly controlling to highly autonomous. A total autonomy score was derived for each respondent based on his/her responses to all 32 items. This score was taken to reflect the extent to which a respondent was control oriented versus autonomy granting in his/her communications with students.

Teachers were also interviewed at the end of the school year. One aspect of the teacher interviews is relevant to the present study: Teachers were asked to list their classroom rules, stressing those considered to be the most important, and to provide rationales for their importance. In addition, teachers were asked to verify lists of classroom lists generated by target students in their classes. This last bit of information was needed to generate one of the student content-knowledge scores used in subsequent analyses: This was a proportional score (i.e., matches divided by matches plus mismatches) representing the amount of rule agreement between student and teacher.

Results and Discussion

The presentation and discussion of results will be organized around the following key research questions:

1. Are the students who teachers rate as being more competent in fulfilling the student role also more knowledgeable regarding classroom norms and standards? Are those students better social problem solvers with interpersonal and task demands?
2. What student attitudes or achievement variables are most predictive of students' problem-solving abilities in the two socialization domains?
3. How do teachers' goal and control orientations relate to students' knowledgeability regarding appropriate rules and standards?
4. How do these teacher variables relate to students' social problem-solving ability with interpersonal and task demands?

Starting with the first question, it was thought that children who were more knowledgeable about what was expected of them, and better able to use such knowledge in the face of everyday problem situations, would be rated higher by teachers in their social adjustment than those who were less knowledgeable in both senses.

The specific content-knowledge variables examined in relation to Question 1 included the match-mismatch proportional score described earlier, which reflects the amount of student-teacher agreement regarding classroom rules, and two additional proportional scores: one indicative of students' ability to identify well socialized students in the task-demands area (i.e., who the good workers are), the other, in the interpersonal area (i.e., who gets along very well with others). A procedure developed by Halperin (1976) was used to derive these last two scores, which reflect the extent to which other students agree with the individual subject's choices. Three process-knowledge variables were included in the analysis, both obtained from a modified version of the students' MEPS (Spivack, Shure, & Platt, 1981). These scores represent social problem-solving ability in the task-demands domain, in the interpersonal domain, and an overall or combined index of social problem-solving ability.

The results of this study provide *no* support for the posited relationship between students' content and process knowledge and socialization competency status as measured by teacher ratings. Thus, correlations between teacher ratings of social competency and the five outcome variables outlined above (three content and two process-knowledge variables) ranged from .10 to -.23; none of these correlations was statistically significant. Although unexpected, this result is congruent with results of another IRT research study in which students identified as "problem students" turned out to be as knowledgeable as other students about behavioral standards in the classroom

(Rohrkemper, 1981). There are plausible explanations for these results. It may be that teachers' ratings of adjustment were primarily based on the extent to which students were cooperative and compliant in the classroom, behaviors which do not bear any necessary relationship to the ability to think about socialization issues in a controlled setting (i.e., the interview). Along these lines, it is also possible that a "halo" effect was at work, although this was controlled for as much as possible in the selection of students. In other words, teachers' perceptions of students' *social* adjustment may well have been colored by a factor such as student ability, with the more able students being perceived as better adjusted than those who were less able. Brophy and Evertson (1981), among others, document that halo effects are often a problem when obtaining teacher ratings.

Even though there was no relationship between the three measures of socialization competency employed in this study--teacher ratings, content knowledge, and process knowledge--interesting patterns of results did emerge for the measure of students' social problem-solving ability. The remaining research questions discussed below address the relationships found between this variable and certain student and teacher variables.

Question 2 is concerned with the relationship between the ability to socially problem solve and a variety of student variables, including reading achievement, self-perceptions of control (i.e. unknown source of control) in both the cognitive and social domains, and the three proportional scores described earlier which reflect knowledge of classroom norms and standards. (It should be noted here that only *positive* perceived-control scales were used in this and subsequent analyses because of evidence presented by Harter (1982), which indicates that children differ markedly in their knowledge about, and willingness to assume, responsibility for failure outcomes.) A stepwise regression procedure was used for this purpose.

In the initial analysis, task-demands and interpersonal problem-solving scores were combined to yield a single dependent variable. This is reasonable given the high correlation between the two indices ($r = .66$). For purposes of this analysis, parallel-cognitive and social-unknown control scales were combined. The overall multiple regression equation was significant ($F = 3.20$; $p < .01$), indicating that one or more of the variables selected does predict students' social problem-solving ability. A multiple correlation (R) of .49 was attained, indicating that approximately 24% of the variance in social problem-solving ability could be explained by performance on the five independent measures included in the analysis.

Reading achievement entered the equation first and was the *only* independent variable to contribute significantly to the total explained variance; approximately 16% of the total variance in children's social problem-solving ability was explained by this variable. This finding runs counter to research reviewed by Spivack et al. (1976) suggesting that students' social problem-solving ability is not merely a function of intelligence or verbal ability. However, it is consistent with the more recent research of Knepper, Obrzut, and Copeland (1983) and Pelligrini (1985); the results of these studies indicate that level of cognitive development does play a role in students' social problem-solving skill development.

The following independent variables were included in the regression analysis, which focused just on problem solving in the interpersonal domain: reading achievement, social-unknown control, and the index measuring students' knowledge of who gets along best in school.

Overall, the predictor variables did account for a significant amount of variance in social problem-solving ability ($F = 4.85$, $p < .01$). A total multiple correlation (R) of .47 was obtained, indicating that 22% of the variance

in interpersonal social problem-solving ability could be explained by students' performance on the three independent measures included in the analysis. Again, however, reading achievement entered the equation first, and was the only predictor variable to make a significant contribution to the total explained variance: 21% of the total variance in students' interpersonal social problem-solving ability was explained by this factor alone. This is consistent with the results described above, where overall social problem-solving ability was found to be primarily a function of reading achievement.

Students' social problem-solving ability with task demands was examined using a parallel set of "cognitive" predictors. Once again, the overall multiple regression equation was significant ($F = 3.67$, $p < .02$), indicating that one can predict the task-demands aspect of social problem-solving ability (SPSA-TD) given knowledge of students' performance on the three independent variables included in the analysis. A multiple correlation (R) of .42 was attained; thus approximately 18% of the variance in the task-demands aspect of social problem-solving ability was explained by the predictor measures. Departing from the previous pattern, however, it was the cognitive-unknown source-of-control scale (i.e., tapping student knowledgeability about the causes of academic success) that accounted for a significant ($p < .03$) amount of variance in task-demands problem solving. Neither reading achievement nor "good worker" content knowledge significantly predicted problem-solving ability in the task-demands socialization domain. It was the student who was cognitively "in the know" who performed better on the means-ends, task-demands problem-solving measure. This makes sense when considered in conjunction with what is known about socialization in general: Knowledge of what is expected, as well as of what influences or controls the outcome of events, generally enhances one's ability to adapt to the environment.

In considering these results, however, the question that immediately comes to mind is why the unknown control variable only predicts cognitive and not social adaptability. There are several possibilities: It may be related to the fact that the focus was on positive outcomes in the two domains. In the interpersonal domain, knowledge of who or what controls *negative* outcomes may be more relevant in terms of influencing social problem-solving ability. Support for this notion is found in Stein and Goldman (1981) who suggest, for example, that "the ability to foresee potential reasons for failing to be friendly or popular is a more important predictive factor than is the ability to list a number of ways to be friendly" (p. 317). Thus, more comparable results across the two domains might have emerged had subjects' perceived control over *negative* social and *positive* cognitive outcomes been examined. This analysis is currently being conducted.

Alternatively, it may be that teachers, even interpersonally oriented teachers, do not assign students the same degree of responsibility for solving problems in the two domains. There may be a greater expectation that students will learn how to overcome difficulties in the task-demands area (such as how to allocate time so that assignments get completed); consequently, teachers may be more explicit in this regard, imparting information to students that is useful in resolving task-demands dilemmas. Related to this notion is Harter's (1982) research suggesting that the cognitive and social domains are perceived quite differently, at least by young children. According to Harter, young children "do not view social acceptance by peers or mother as an arena of their life that requires skill or competence" (1982, p. 233). If this view persists into middle childhood, children themselves would be less inclined to respond to teacher socialization attempts in the interpersonal domain.

The third question that was addressed concerned classroom or teacher variables that might be related to students' knowledgeability regarding appropriate rules and standards. Specifically, interest centered on the effects of teacher socialization priority and control orientation on children's content knowledge in the two socialization domains. Socialization priority was assessed using the Teacher Priorities Questionnaire discussed earlier in this report. Control orientation was examined through teachers' responses to the Deci et al. (1981) measure, also described above. The dependent variables in the analyses of variance were proportional scores reflecting students' ability to identify well-socialized classmates in each of the two socialization domains (i.e., "good workers" in the task domain and "kids who get along well" in the interpersonal domain). The justification for selecting these particular content-knowledge outcome variables comes from Halperin (1976) who found, for example, that students' ability to accurately assess good-worker status was linked to teacher goal orientation.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the results, it is necessary to describe briefly the overall sample in terms of their control orientation. Scores on the Deci et al. (1981) measure can, in theory, range from a low of -18 (highly controlling) to a high of +18 (high in autonomy granting). In the analyses discussed below, teachers in this study were categorized as either higher or lower in *control* orientation. Means obtained on the Deci measure for these two groups were 2.09 and 8.25, respectively. Thus, the teacher sample in this study consisted of teachers who can best be termed "moderately controlling" and "moderately to highly autonomy granting" in their interactions with students.

Results of the ANOVA indicate that there is *no* relationship between teacher socialization priority and student content knowledge in the task-demands area (i.e., ability to identify good workers) ($F(1,6) = .78$, $p < .41$), nor does teacher control orientation emerge as a significant predictor in this regard ($F(1,6) = .85$, $p < .39$). Turning to teacher influences on content knowledge in the interpersonal domain (i.e., the ability to identify those who get along well), teacher socialization priority once again failed to account for a significant amount of variance ($F(1,6) = .43$, $p < .53$), as did teacher control orientation ($F(1,6) = .54$, $p < .49$).

It is not immediately clear why this pattern of results emerged. It may simply be that, at least in terms of the teacher control variable, the lack of extremes in the teacher sample contributed to the lack of significant results. If we indeed had a *highly* controlling teacher contingent, we might have attained more meaningful results.

In the final research question, relationships between teacher priority and control variables and students' social problem-solving ability was examined. As above, results indicate that teacher socialization priority is not predictive of overall problem-solving ability ($F(1,6) = 1.58$, $p < .25$); nor is it predictive of interpersonal ($F(1,6) = .60$, $p < .47$) and task-demands problem solving ($F(1,6) = 3.69$, $p < .10$). However, significant main effects were found for two of the teacher control orientation problem-solving relationships: that for the overall ($F(1,6) = 5.79$, $p < .05$) and task-demands measures ($F(1,6) = 5.80$, $p < .05$). The relationship between teacher control orientation and interpersonal social problem-solving ability was marginally significant ($F(1,6) = 4.56$, $p < .08$). For all three relationships, teachers in the moderately controlling classrooms performed better in social problem-solving than did students in the more autonomy-granting classrooms.

Assuming that teachers' control orientation is linked to teacher behavior in the classroom (see Deci et al., 1981 and Halperin, 1976, for a discussion of the relationship between teacher-control orientation and teacher behavior), it appears that a more controlling or highly structured classroom climate is more facilitative of social problem-solving skills than is a less structured, more autonomy-granting classroom atmosphere. Some support for this notion can be found in the literature that suggests that learning outcomes are enhanced by higher levels of teacher structure. Brophy and Good (1984), in their review chapter on relationships between teacher behavior and student achievement, presented numerous studies which suggest that achievement is maximized by higher levels of teacher structuring (e.g., Dunkin, 1978; Smith & Sanders, 1981; Solomon & Kendall, 1979). It seems reasonable to suggest that children's social problem-solving ability might be similarly enhanced by teachers' structuring behaviors, particularly since it is differences in *task-demands* problem solving that apparently play the key role in the analyses presented above.

The above pattern of results also seems compatible with a broad base of literature on more general socialization practices; in particular, it seems to fit well with research relating to effective parenting. Baumrind (1968; 1972) identified an "authoritative" style of parenting that was associated with greater development in children of self-confidence, independence, and achievement motivation. This parenting style was characterized by an inductive approach, in which parents used explanations and reasoning to induce good behavior, and then provided clear limits to children's behavior, with some choices within those limits. This style seems congruent with the moderately controlling orientation characterizing the more "effective" teachers in the present study.

To summarize, while results discussed thus far shed little light about teacher influences on students' content knowledge in the two socialization domains, some interesting findings did emerge when we looked at the process dimension. It appears that "control" is a key issue relating to students' social problem-solving ability--at least as measured with the MEPS procedure: As a teacher variable, control orientation significantly relates to social problem-solving ability, particularly in the task domain, while at the student level, knowledge regarding control over cognitive outcomes is predictive of the same ability. It is thought that a more controlling environment is beneficial in terms of promoting the process-knowledge aspect of students' socialization into the student role because such an environment is more *predictable*. This may be vital to students as they strive to grapple with everyday classroom problem situations, particularly in the task-demands domain. A more predictable environment should also enhance students' sense of control, which in turn affects the ways in which they approach the dilemmas of everyday classroom life.

Although the results of the quantitative analyses discussed above suggest that teachers' socialization-priority systems do not significantly relate to children's socialization into the student role, results of more qualitative analyses done on the data indicate that this may not be the case as far as certain kinds of knowledge are concerned. Thus, as will be shown below, close examination of student interview responses points to an important relationship between the types of norms and standards students are exposed to and teachers' socialization priority (interpersonal versus task-demands focus).

Qualitative Analysis

Student responses to interview items were coded using a variety of coding systems developed specifically for use in the present study. Frequency data were generated on the basis of this coding. In this final section, a descriptive account of these data is provided to supplement the information gained from the more quantitative or statistical analyses of this investigation. It is possible to conceive of a variety of ways to look at these data. Given the socialization focus of this study, which has been cast in terms of two types of role demands, we decided to examine qualitative data in light of the emphasis teachers place on these two aspects of the student role. Thus, responses are contrasted for students in two types of classrooms: those where teachers claim to emphasize interpersonal socialization outcomes and those where they claim to emphasize task demands socialization outcomes.

Students' perceptions of norms and standards for behavioral conduct in the classroom were assessed by the following interview items:

1. What are the rules in Mrs. _____'s classroom? Tell me as many as you know.

2. Now, of all the rules you just mentioned, which is the very most important one of all? Why is (most important rule) so important?

3. What is the worst think a kid can do in Mrs. _____'s classroom? Why is that so bad?

4. When you think about all the things you do in Mrs. _____'s class, what is the one thing you could do that would make Mrs. _____ really happy? Why would that make Mrs. _____ so very happy?

Overall, students in interpersonal and task-demands classrooms look remarkably similar in terms of the numbers of rules given (IP = 142, TD = 162) and the proportion of responses given in each general domain category considered (task, interpersonal, and procedural). Both groups placed primary emphasis on procedural rules (IP = 44%; TD = 36%), followed by

task-related rules (IP = 28%, TD = 30%); both groups placed least emphasis on interpersonal rules (25% vs. 19%). Subjects' rule statements probably reflect fairly well the actual classroom situations: Most rules in the classroom are likely to be geared toward keeping things running smoothly (i.e., procedural in nature). Since the school is a workplace, task-related rules should also be fairly prominent, followed, perhaps, by rules in the interpersonal domain. The assumption of congruence between student rule perceptions and reality is reasonable given the high degree of student-teacher agreement as reflected in the match-mismatch score.

Within rule domains, some interesting differences do appear between interpersonal and task-demands classrooms. Because the procedural domain was the most frequently used category, discussion will focus on this area. Within this domain, rules relating to movement/space were most often given by both groups of students. Approximately 22% of all rules given by students in interpersonal classrooms and 21% of all rules given by students in task-demands classrooms were of this sort. Exclusive of rules for movement/space, the two groups differed in their emphasis on type of procedural rule. Those in interpersonal classrooms concentrated on rules governing "social" behavior during procedural routines; over 24% of their procedural rules were of this sort, as compared to 5% of the procedural rules given by task-demands students. In other words, five times as many "social" procedural rules were offered by students in classrooms emphasizing interpersonal as compared to task demands. For those in task-demands classrooms, the procedural rule category receiving greatest emphasis (following movement/space rules) was one pertaining to how to respond to or get the teacher's attention. Almost 19% of the procedural rules given by task-demands students were of this sort, as compared to less than 10% of interpersonal students' procedural rules. In other

words, the emphasis placed on this type of procedural rule by those in classrooms with a task-demands orientation was nearly twice that of those in the other type of classroom.

Differences in perceived classroom norm structure also emerged between students in the two types of classrooms when rule responses within the task-demands and interpersonal-socialization domains were examined. These differences were congruent with those found in the procedural domain (for a full discussion see Anderson, 1985).

Priority-related differences were also found when students were asked to focus on behavioral infractions, or the worst thing a student could do in a class. While both interpersonal and task-demands groups focused primarily on transgressions in the interpersonal domain, interpersonal students were more extreme in this regard. Over 90% of all their responses were of this sort, as compared to about 69% for their task-demands counterparts. In their responses, the interpersonal students concentrated heavily on physical transgressions; approximately 69% of all their responses to the "worst thing" question were of this sort. Interestingly, only task-demands students gave responses to the "worst thing" question that fell into the task domain. Approximately 22% of their responses were of this sort, most pertaining to task completion.

In talking about things they could do to make their teacher the very happiest, both groups of students focused primarily on things in the task domain. There was a stronger emphasis on these sorts of things, however, in task-demands classrooms (75% vs. 53% of responses). For both groups of students, the single most important thing students felt they could do to make their teachers happy was to get their work done. For each group, approximately 28% of all responses to this interview item related to work completion.

This finding is consistent with other research which suggests that children's primary concern is to complete their work assignments in whatever way they can (Anderson, Brubaker, Alleman-Brooks, & Duffy, 1984).

Based on results of the qualitative analysis, it is fair to say that the interpersonal and task-demands groups have somewhat different perceptions regarding norms and standards for behavioral conduct in the classroom. Presumably, these differences are due to differential teacher emphasis on various aspects of classroom life. An examination of student rationales for classroom norms and standards points to a further distinction in perception between task-demands and interpersonal groups.

In terms of type of rationale given, the primary distinction between the two groups relates to "authoritarian-moralistic" rationales. These are stated either in terms of the teacher's authority in the classroom, or they in some way resemble "preaching" or "moralizing" (e.g., "You're not here to visit, you're here to learn"). Students in task-demands classrooms stressed this type of rationale more than the other two types examined--the social or individual. Those in interpersonal type classrooms used it the least, with only 9% of their rationales being of this type. These students tended to stress social rationales the most (44%), but this finding should be considered in light of other results from the project which show that there is little relationship between the number of social rationales reported by students and the number actually given by teachers (Bird, Anderson, & Prawat, 1985). This issue of the link between what students "hear" and what teachers say is being examined as data analysis proceeds.

Regardless of how this analysis turns out, it does seem evident, based on the qualitative analysis, that part of the teacher-socialization message is getting through. Why this part of the message--that is, relating to teacher

socialization priority--does not relate to student problem-solving ability in the task-demands and interpersonal domains is a puzzle. It may be that the process-knowledge variable used in this study is inadequate as a measure of social problem-solving ability; however, a number of studies support the validity of the MEPS instrument for this purpose. Alternatively, these results may be attributable to the fact that there is a big difference between students simply being aware of rules and standards and actually being able to use this information to guide their behavior in the classroom. Getting students to understand what is expected of them may be a necessary but not sufficient condition as far as socialization is concerned. Assuming this perspective, it makes sense that teacher socialization priority impacts on the kind of normative information available to students as indicated by the qualitative analysis; the ability to apply this information, on the other hand, at least in the task-demands area, should logically relate more to process-oriented teacher measures such as the Deci et al. control/autonomy instrument. In other words, the Deci measure may tap a dimension of teaching that is more germane to instructional effectiveness, while the Teacher Priorities Questionnaire may relate more to the kind of information teachers choose to make available to students.

All of this is highly speculative, of course, particularly in light of the limited number of classrooms involved in the study. Nevertheless, the study presented here does raise several important issues that are worthy of further examination.

References

Anderson, A. L. H. (1985). Socialization into the elementary school student role: An examination of student and teacher influences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Anderson, L. M., Brubaker, N. L., Alleman-Brooks, J., & Duffy, G. G. (1984). Making seatwork work (Research Series No. 142). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. Adolescence, 3, 255-272.

Baumrind, D. (1972). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. In W. W. Hartup (Ed.), The young child: Reviews of research (Vol. 2, pp. 202-224). Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Biddle, B. J. (1979). Role theory. New York: Academic Press.

Bird, D. E., Anderson, L. M., & Prawat, R. S. (1985, April). Student perceptions and teachers' rationale statements. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Student characteristics and teaching. New York: Longman, Inc.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1984, April). Teacher behavior and student achievement (Occasional Paper No. 73). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Connell, J. P. (1980). A multidimensional measure of children's perceptions of control. Denver: University of Denver (Colorado Seminary).

Deci, E. L., Schwartz, A. J., Sheinman, L., & Ryan, R. M. (1981). An instrument to assess adults' orientations toward control versus autonomy with children: Reflections on intrinsic motivation and perceived competence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 642-650.

Dunkin, M. (1978). Student characteristics, classroom processes, and student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 998-1009.

Halperin, M. S. (1976). First-grade teachers' goals and children's developing perceptions of school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 636-648.

Harter, S. (1982). A model of mastery motivation in children: Individual differences and developmental change. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), Aspects of the development of competence: Vol. 14. The Minnesota symposium on child psychology (pp. 215-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harter, S. (1979). Perceived competence scale for children: Manual, Form O. Denver: University of Denver (Colorado Seminary).

Harter, S. (1980). A scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom, Manual. Denver: University of Denver (Colorado Seminary).

Harter, S., & Connell, J. P. (1981). A model of the relationship among children's academic achievement and their self-perceptions of competence, control, and motivational orientation. In. J. Nicholls, (Ed.), The development of achievement motivation (pp. 219-250). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hartup, W. W. (1979). The social worlds of childhood. American Psychologist, 34, 944-950.

Kendall, P. C., & Fischler, G. L. (1984). Behavioral and adjustment correlates of problem solving: Validational analyses of interpersonal cognitive problem-solving measures. Child Development, 55, 879-892.

Knepper, W., Obrzut, J. E., & Copeland, E. P. (1983). Emotional and social problem-solving thinking in gifted and average elementary school children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 142, 25-30.

Nickerson, J. R., & Prawat, R. S. (1981). Affective interactions in racially diverse classrooms: A case study. Elementary School Journal, 81, 291-303.

Pelligrini, D. S. (1985). Social cognition and competence in middle childhood. Child Development, 56, 253-264.

Prawat, R. S., Anderson, D., Anderson, A., Jenkins, F., & Anderson, L. (1983, April). The development of an instrument to measure teacher goal orientations. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Rohrkemper, M. M. (1981). Classroom perspectives study: An investigation of differential perceptions of classroom events. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1972). Means-ends thinking, adjustment, and social class among elementary-school-aged children. Journal of Counsulting and Clinical Psychology, 38, 348-353.

Singleton, L.C., & Asher, S. R. (1979). Racial integration and children's peer preferences: An investigation of developmental and cohort differences. Child Development, 50, 936-941.

Smith, L., & Sanders, K. (1981). The effects of student achievement and student perception of varying structure in social studies content. Journal of Educational Research, 74, 333-336.

Solomon, D., & Kendall, A. (1979). Children in classrooms: An investigation of person-environment interaction. New York: Praeger.

Spivack, G., Platt, J. J., & Shure, M. B. (1976). The problem-solving approach to adjustment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spivack, G., Shure, M. B., & Platt, J. J. (1981). Means-ends problem solving: Stimuli and scoring procedures supplement. Philadelphia, PA: Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, Department of Mental Health Sciences.

Stein, N. L., & Goldman, S. R. (1981). Children's knowledge about social situations: From causes to consequences. In S. R. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendship (pp. 297-321). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.